

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR THE CITY OF KALISPELL'S
WATER TANK, PIPELINE AND WEST VIEW WELL HOUSE**

TO: ALL INTERESTED PERSONS

Date: February 1, 2007

Action: Funding the City's Water Tank, Pipeline and West View Well House

Location of Project: Kalispell, Montana

DEQ Funding: \$1,500,000.

Total Project Cost: \$3,400,000.

An environmental review has been conducted by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for proposed funding for improvements to the city of Kalispell's water system. The proposed project involves the construction of a new 2 MG concrete water tank, approximately 10,000 lineal feet of buried water piping and a new well building at the West View Well site. The purpose of the project is to make improvements to the city's water system that are needed to protect public health.

The affected environment will primarily be the proposed tank site on Sheepherder's Hill west of the city, a Bonneville Power Administration powerline easement where the new pipeline will be constructed, and a small site in the West View subdivision north of town where the well house will be constructed. The human environment affected will include the city of Kalispell and surrounding area. Based on the information provided in the references below, the project is not expected to have any significant adverse impacts upon terrestrial and aquatic life or habitat, including endangered species, water quality or quantity, air quality, geological features, cultural or historical features, or social quality.

This project will be funded in part with a low interest loan through the Montana Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program, administered by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation.

The Department of Environmental Quality utilized the following references in completing its environmental review of this project: a Uniform Environmental Checklist for Montana Public Facility Projects, prepared by Robert Peccia and Associates, the city's consulting engineer; and an environmental checklist completed by the Department of Environmental Quality. In addition to these references, letters were sent to the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, the Montana Department of Environmental Quality, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Montana State Historic Preservation Office. Responses have been received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Environmental Quality and the State Historic Preservation Office. These references are available for review upon request by contacting:

Gary J. Wiens, P.E.,
Department of Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 200901
Helena, MT 59620-0901
Phone: (406) 444-7838
Email: gwiens@mt.gov

Comments on this finding or on the EA may be submitted to the Department of Environmental Quality at the above address. Comments must be postmarked no later than March 5, 2007. After evaluating substantive comments received, the department will revise the EA or determine if an EIS is necessary. Otherwise, this finding of no significant impact will stand if no substantive comments are received during the comment period or if substantive comments are received and evaluated and the environmental impacts are still determined to be non-significant.

Signed,

Todd Teegarden, Chief
Technical & Financial Assistance Bureau

c: file

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

The following questions have been developed to assist DEQ in conducting its environmental review of DWSRF projects. This checklist should be completed by the review engineer utilizing personal knowledge and interdisciplinary expertise along with the PER and Uniform Application EA checklist.

Additional space for comments is provided under the heading Discussion and References. In narrative form, the DEQ reviewer should describe any problems judged to be environmentally significant. The DEQ reviewer should reference the source of judgment. As an example, this could be an expert biological opinion or the comments of a local or county planner.

This checklist should also be used as a reference when preparing an EA report. Significant issues should be evaluated further and, where appropriate, discussed in an EA report. Alternatives that avoid adverse impacts should be considered. Mitigation measures to overcome impacts should be adopted. Unavoidable adverse impacts should be identified.

[Instructions: Write in the appropriate response on the line adjacent to the checklist item, i.e., Y (yes), N (no), NA (not applicable), PA (possibly adverse), PB (possibly beneficial), U (unknown), NK (none known) or any other appropriate comment). Use comment area at end of checklist to explain when necessary.]

1. Physical Aspects - Topography, Geology and Soils

- | | | |
|----|--|------------------------------|
| a. | Are there physical conditions (e.g., steep slopes, shrink-swell soils, etc.) that might be adversely affected by or might affect construction of the proposed project? | <u> N </u> |
| b. | Are there similar limiting physical conditions in the planning area that might make development unsuitable? | <u> N </u> |
| c. | Are there any unusual or unique geological features that might be affected? | <u> N </u> |
| d. | Are there any hazardous areas (slides, faults) that might affect construction or development? | <u> N </u> |

Discussion and References:

According to the geotechnical evaluation report prepared by SK Geotechnical, no soils,
topographic or geological conditions are likely to adversely affect the construction of the project.

2. Climate

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Are there any unusual or special meteorological constraints in the planning area that might result in an air quality problem? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Are there any unusual or special meteorological constraints in the planning area that affect the feasibility of the proposed project? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

The contract specifications will have provisions for the control of dust during construction activity.

3. Population

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Are the proposed growth rates unreasonable? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Will new housing serviced by this facility affect existing facilities, transportation patterns, environmentally sensitive areas, or be in special hazard or danger zones? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will new housing create strains on other utilities and service (police, power, water supply, hospital care, schools, etc.)? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

4. Economics and Social Profile

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Does documentation exist which suggests that the local populace cannot afford the proposed project? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Will the facilities adversely affect land values? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Are any poor or disadvantaged groups especially affected by this project? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

5. Land Use

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| a. | Will projected growth defeat the purpose of any known local land use controls? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Is the location of the facilities incompatible with any known local land use plans? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will inhabited areas be adversely impacted by the project site? | <u>N</u> |
| d. | Will new development have adverse effects on older existing land uses (agriculture, forest land, etc.)? | <u>N</u> |
| e. | Will this project contribute to changes in land use in association with recreation (skiing, parks, etc.), mining or other large industrial or energy developments? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

The new well is located in the West View Estates Subdivision. Approximately 8,000 lineal feet of new water transmission main will be constructed in a Bonneville Power Administration overhead power line easement to connect the new well to a new 2.0 MG buried concrete storage reservoir to be constructed on Sheepherder's Hill in the foothills to the west of Kalispell.

6. Floodplain Development

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Does the project area contain 100-year floodplains? | <u>N</u> |
| | If yes to a., then: | |
| b. | Will the project be constructed in a 100-year floodplain? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will the project serve direct or indirect development in a 100-year floodplain anywhere in the planning area? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

7. Wetlands

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| a. | Does the planning area contain wetlands or riparian areas? | <u>N</u> |
| | If yes to a., then: | |
| b. | Will any major part of the project be located on or affect wetlands or riparian areas? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will the project serve growth and development which will directly or indirectly affect wetlands or riparian areas? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

8. Wild & Scenic Rivers

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| a. | Does the planning area contain a designated or proposed wild and scenic river? | <u>N</u> |
| | If yes to a., then: | |
| b. | Will the project be constructed near the river? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will projected growth and development take place contiguous to or upstream from the river segment? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

9. Cultural Resources (Archaeological/Historical)

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| a. | Was the Montana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) contacted (usually by applicant utilizing the Uniform Application process) concerning historic, architectural, archaeological issues in the planning area? | <u>Y</u> |
| | If yes to a., then: | |
| b. | Was SHPO's response included with the application? | <u>Y</u> |
| c. | Was SHPO's response such that the project may not continue without further action or investigation by the applicant? | <u>Y</u> |

Discussion and References:

In a letter dated November 14, 2006, Damon Murdo, Cultural Records Manager of SHPO, noted that based on his cultural resource file search "there have been no previously recorded sites within the designated search locales." He recommended that a cultural resource inventory be conducted to determine whether sites exist and if they will be impacted by construction of the pipeline or water reservoir. The city's consultant will include provisions in the project specifications requiring suspension of construction activities in the event cultural resources are discovered so that the significance of the materials can be investigated.

10. Flora and Fauna (including endangered species)

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Are any designated, threatened or endangered species (or their habitat) known to exist in, or use, the planning area? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Will the project have any known direct or indirect adverse impacts on known designated species? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will the project have any known direct or indirect adverse impacts on fish, wildlife or their habitat including migratory routes, wintering or calving areas? | <u>N</u> |
| d. | Does the planning area include a sensitive habitat area designated by a local, state, or federal wildlife agency? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

11. Recreation and Open Space

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| a. | Will the project eliminate or modify recreational open space, parks or areas of recognized scenic or recreational value? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Is it feasible to combine the project with parks, bicycle paths, hiking trails, waterway access and other recreational uses? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

12. Agricultural Lands

- | | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|
| a. | Does the planning area contain any known environmentally significant agricultural lands (prime, unique, statewide importance, local importance, etc.)? | <u>N</u> |
| If yes to a., then: | | |
| b. | Will the project directly or indirectly encourage the irreversible conversion of environmentally significant agricultural lands to uses which result in the loss of these lands as an environmental or essential food production resource? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

13. Water Quality and Quantity (Surface/Groundwater)

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| a. | Will water rights be adversely affected by the project? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Will the project cause a significant amount of water to be transferred from one sub-basin to another? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Will the project adversely affect the quantity or quality of a groundwater resource? | <u>N</u> |
| d. | Does the project adversely affect an aquifer used as a drinking water supply? | <u>N</u> |
| e. | Are there additional cost-effective water conservation measures that could be adopted by the community to reduce water consumption? | <u>NK</u> |

Discussion and References:

The well has been drilled and pump tested; laboratory analysis indicates there are no water quality concerns. At a proposed pumping rate of 1200 gpm and a static water level of 150 feet below the ground surface, no adverse effects on groundwater resources are anticipated. Test well plans and specifications were approved by DEQ prior to well drilling. Final plans must be approved by DEQ and DNRC before the well is placed in service.

14. Public Health

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Will there be adverse direct or indirect noise impacts from the project? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Is there evidence of any unique public health problems that may result from the proposed project (e.g. increased disease risk)? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

Impacts on the public are expected to be positive, in that a greater quantity of water will be available to serve the upper pressure zone.

15. Waste Management (Including water treatment plant residuals, backwash water, sanitary wastes and solid wastes associated with the project)

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| a. | Will waste disposal occur in an area with inadequate sanitary landfills or on land unsuitable for land application? | <u>N</u> |
| b. | Are there special problems with the waste that make disposal difficult (hazardous or difficult to treat)? | <u>N</u> |
| c. | Is the technology selected for waste disposal controversial? | <u>N</u> |

Discussion and References:

16. Energy

- a. Are there additional cost-effective measures to reduce energy consumption or increase energy recovery which could be included in the project?

N

Discussion and References:

17. Regionalization

- a. Are there jurisdictional disputes or controversy over the project?
- b. Have inter-jurisdictional agreements been signed?

N

NA

Discussion and References:

18. Public Participation

- a. Is there a substantial level of public controversy?
- b. Is there inadequate evidence of public participation in the project?

N

N

Discussion and References:

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION

Project Name: Kalispell 2.0 MG Water Tank and West View Well

Project Number: WRF number not yet assigned

Reviewer: Gary J. Wiens, P.E.

Date: February 1, 2007

An Environmental Review for the above-referenced project has been completed. Based on this review, it has been determined that the appropriate environmental review and finding for the project is a:

- Categorical Exclusion (Cat Ex if available) _____
- Environmental Assessment (EA) checklist and
Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) X
- Narrative EA and FONSI _____
- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) _____

Provide a copy of the EA (or draft EA - if a draft is issued for public comment)
and the Finding to the Legislative Environmental Policy Office. _____